

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

**DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION SURVEYS  
FOR THE FOOD STAMP  
CASH-OUT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS**

**FINAL REPORT**

**Prepared by:**

**The Urban Institute  
Barbara Cohen  
Nathan Young  
Lee Bawden**

**Prepared for:**

**Food and Nutrition Service  
U.S. Department of Agriculture**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**This report was prepared by the Urban Institute under Contract No. FNS 53-3198-8-97 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis and Evaluation. National Opinion Research Corporation (NORC), under subcontract to the Urban Institute, was responsible for assisting in the development and field testing of the household survey and accompanying training materials and data processing software.**

**Several individuals participated in the preparation of this report. The primary researchers at the Urban Institute were Barbara Cohen, Nathan Young and Lee Bawden. Pat Marnell, Suzanne Turner and Nick Holt of NORC contributed portions on the field test and data processing.**

**Pat Dinkelacker, Boyd Kowal and Carol Olander of the Food and Nutrition Service provided guidance in the development of all survey instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures and the preparation of the final report.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN.....	8
III. CORE HOUSEHOLD SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	14
A. Development of Survey Instrument.....	14
B. Issues Encountered in Development of Instrument.....	18
C. Field Test of Draft Instrument.....	24
D. Sampling and Other Data Collection Issues.....	30
E. Data Collection Plan.....	40
F. Training Materials.....	46
G. Data Processing and Conversion Software.....	48
H. Quality Assurance Procedures.....	52
I. Data Analysis Plan.....	55
IV. ADMINISTRATIVE COST SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	61
A. Study Objectives and Variables.....	62
B. Development of Instrument.....	65
C. Data Collection Plan.....	67
D. Data Analysis Plan.....	68
REFERENCES.....	73
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX 1 - Study Objectives and Variables for the Household Survey	
APPENDIX 2 - Study Objectives and Variables for the Administrative Cost Survey	

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Historically, Food Stamp Program benefits have been available to recipients in the form of coupons which may be exchanged for food at USDA authorized food retailers. There has been continuous discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of using alternative forms of benefits, such as checks, as a way of enhancing the program's effectiveness. The advantages include complete recipient choice in food purchase and reduction of stigma associated with the use of coupons. These factors also may promote program participation by eligible households. Administratively, cash issuance may produce cost savings due to simpler issuance procedures.

On the other hand there could be disadvantages to cashing out food stamps. Cash-out could threaten program integrity and effectiveness. Eliminating restrictions on where and what can be purchased with food benefits could result in greater diversion of benefits to the purchase of non-food items or prepared foods away from home. Such shifts in benefit use could have a negative impact on quality of diet, thus undermining a major program objective. Some advocacy groups oppose cash benefits on the grounds that they would weaken recipients' ability to safeguard resources for food.

Two previous studies have evaluated the effects of food stamp cash-out. The first study, conducted in nine different sites, evaluated the impact of the Food and Nutrition Service sponsored Food Stamp Special Supplemental Income (SSI)/Elderly Cash-Out Demonstration by sampling households of elderly

people and SSI recipients whose food stamp benefits were cashed out in 1980. The second study looked at the impact of a food stamp cash-out which occurred in 1982 when the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico replaced the Food Stamp Program with the Nutritional Assistance Program (NAP). Both of these evaluations studied the effects of switching from food coupons to cash benefits on food expenditures and program administrative costs. In addition, the SSI evaluation studied the effects on dietary intake and the Puerto Rico evaluation studied the effects on food use.

Although these studies provided valuable information, two general factors significantly limit the ability to use their findings to draw inferences about the potential effects of cash-out for the overall food stamp caseload. One limitation is that the effects of cash-out in the two specific program settings may have been smaller than the effects that would be observed for the general food stamp recipient population. For example, in Puerto Rico, focus group discussions with former food stamp recipients indicated that an extensive black market for food stamps existed on the Island prior to cash-out. Such use of coupons is likely to reduce the effects of food benefits on household food expenditures and food use. In the SSI/Elderly Demonstration, elderly households tended on average to have quite low levels of food stamp benefits relative to overall income. Consequently, it is possible that the use of coupons may have had less of an impact on this group than it would on households for which food stamps comprised a greater share of total resources.

The confidence that can be placed in the findings from the Puerto Rico and SSI/Elderly evaluations is also limited by the methodological constraints within which these evaluations were conducted. In particular, neither of these previous experiences with cash-out was structured to include the random assignment of individuals to cash-out versus coupon status. Consequently, both evaluations were forced to rely on matched comparison group methodologies, and in neither study was it possible to place high levels of confidence in the degree of similarity between the cash-out and the comparison groups.

The Food and Nutrition Service is currently planning to examine the effects of cash-out in four separate demonstrations. The Urban Institute and National Opinion Research Corporation (NORC) will evaluate the Washington State Family Independence Program (FIP) demonstration. Mathematica Policy Research and National Analysts will evaluate the Alabama Cash-Out and San Diego demonstrations. The contract for evaluating the Alabama Avenues to Self-Sufficiency Through Employment and Training Services (ASSETS) evaluation has been awarded to ABT Associates. The four planned demonstrations will enable the Food and Nutrition Service to evaluate the effects of food stamp cash-out in different social, economic and geographical contexts. Each of the four sites will study the effects of cash-out on general household expenditures, household food expenditures, recipient attitudes about the form of the benefits, and administrative costs. With the exception of the Alabama ASSETS study, all sites will also evaluate the effects of cash-out on food use. Both the San Diego and Alabama

ASSETS evaluations will include a study of program participation and retailer impacts. Key features of each project are summarized in Exhibit A. Congressional legislation reflects an interest in the effects of cash-out. Section 21 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended (P.L. 101-55) grants Washington State the authority to cash-out food stamps for voluntary FIP participants and requires the Food and Nutrition Service to evaluate the cash-out program. Section 17 of the same Food Stamp Act allows research to be undertaken that will help improve the administration and effectiveness of the Food Stamp Program. This includes pilot projects designed to test program changes such as paying recipients cash in lieu of coupons. In addition, the Interagency Low Income Opportunity Advisory Board requires that any project the Board approves (i.e., the FIP and ASSETS demonstrations) must be evaluated.

In August, 1989, the Food and Nutrition Service issued a task order to the Urban Institute to develop a core data collection instrument to be used in all Cash-out evaluations. The instruments include a Core Household Expenditure and Food Use Survey and a Core Administrative Cost Survey.

The specific objectives of the task were:

- o To complete the development, field test, and obtain OMB approval of the Core Cash-out Measures.



- o To develop supporting documents for the Core Cash-out Measures such as interviewer training and data collection manuals and guidelines for data base structure and construction of derived measures.

# ATTRIBUTES OF FOUR FOOD STAMP CASH-OUT EVALUATIONS

	ALABAMA CASH-OUT	SAN DIEGO CASH-OUT	ALABAMA ASSETS	WASHINGTON FIP
Geographical Region	South	West	South	North West
Study Population	All FSP cases	All FSP cases	All FSP cases	PA, volunteered to enroll in FIP
Food Stamp/ Total Benefit Ratio	High	Low	High	Moderate
Research Design	Experimental, random assign- ment within 12 sites N* = 2,400	Experimental & pre-post compari- son with treatment saturation N* = 1,200	Matched comparison sites, 3 treatment & 3 comparison N* = 1,200	Matched compari- son sites, 5 treatment & 5 comparison N* = 1,200
Cash-out Effects To Be Examined**	Hh*** resources Hh expenditures Hh food expenditures Recipient attitudes  Hh food use Nutrient availability  Administrative costs	Hh resources Hh expenditures Hh food expenditures Recipient attitudes  Hh food use Nutrient availability  Administrative costs Program participation Retailer effects	Hh resources Hh expenditures Hh food expenditures Recipient attitudes  Hh food use Nutrient availability  Administrative costs Program participation Retailer effects	Hh resources Hh expenditures Hh food expenditures Recipient attitudes  Hh food use Nutrient availability  Administrative costs

EXHIBIT A

\* Number of completed interviews.

\*\* Measures of household resources, expenditures, food expenditures, and recipient attitudes are included in the Core Household Survey.

\*\*\* Hh = household.

- o To develop the survey instrument package for use in FIP Client Interview Study, field test, and obtain OMB approval.

This report presents a review of the tasks and decisions involved in completing the development of the Core Cash-out Survey instruments. After describing the evaluation objectives and design, a description is given of the development of the instruments and the major issues involved in the process. In addition, a discussion of the study protocol for interviewer training, data entry and data processing is included along with a brief review of the data analysis plan.

## **II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN**

The overall goal of the cash-out evaluation is to understand how cashing out food stamp benefits affects households' food expenditures and food use and program operations and costs. The specific evaluation objectives defined by the Food and Nutrition Service are as follows:

1. assess the effects of cash food benefits on household expenditures in major budget categories;
2. assess the effects of cash benefits on household food expenditures, food use, and nutrient availability;
3. assess the effects of cash benefits on food shopping patterns and supplementary sources of food;
4. assess the effects of cash benefits on recipients' attitudes about and experiences with alternative forms of food assistance; and,
5. assess the effects of cash-out on program operations and costs.

Although there are four cash-out evaluations scheduled, they do not represent a duplication of effort. Instead they provide an opportunity to gather comparable data from different demographic populations and from populations that are either voluntarily or mandatorily participating in the cash-

out program. Variations across study sites also include: (1) the nature of the study designs and the ability to control for alternative explanations of cash-out effects; (2) the introduction of concurrent welfare program changes; and, (3) the magnitude of the food stamp benefits relative to other assistance program benefits. With respect to the relative magnitude of food stamp benefits, it is known that the ratio of AFDC payments to Food Stamp benefits is low in Alabama and high in San Diego relative to other States. In Washington State the ratio is between these two other states. These evaluations will provide an opportunity for assessing the effects of cash-out in these different environments.

Both the FIP and ASSETS cash-out programs are part of overall welfare reform programs in those states. For these two projects, the primary objective of food stamp cash-out is to simplify the assistance program operations and to re-allocate potential administrative cost savings towards employment and training services. Both of these demonstrations provide opportunities for estimating the effects of cash-out on Food Stamp Program administrative costs and household expenditures. In addition, the FIP evaluation will look at the cash-out effects on food use and nutrient availability.

In Washington, a matched site comparison design will be used with five treatment and five control sites and approximately 1,200 households (600 cash and 600 coupon recipients) in the cash-out evaluation sample. In the treatment sites, food stamp benefits will be cashed out only for households in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program who

participate in FIP, resulting in a restricted sample of the total food stamp recipient population.

There is a Congressional mandate to evaluate the cash-out effects in the FIP demonstration. The cash-out evaluation will focus on the recipient household effects, including household expenditures and food use and nutrient availability. Assessment of potential changes in administrative costs will require distinguishing effects due to cash-out from those attributable to other FIP interventions. Since cash-out will not be implemented program-wide for all food stamp recipients, it will not be possible to assess cash-out effects (e.g., effects on program participation) that require a treatment saturation design (i.e. cash-out for all Food Stamp Program households in demonstration sites).

The Alabama ASSETS evaluation will also be based on a matched comparison site design with three experimental and three control counties and a sample of approximately 1,200 households. All Food Stamp Program participants in ASSETS counties will be cashed out, providing a treatment saturation situation. Present evaluation plans call for assessment of administrative cost, program participation, household expenditures (but not food use), and retailer impacts.

The fact that both the FIP and ASSETS evaluations are studying a cash-out program that is part of a welfare reform program introduces a potential methodological issue. The effects of cash-out may be confounded or more difficult to detect because of other welfare reform interventions. In addition

the validity of household outcomes may be reduced by the matched comparison design used in both studies.

Additionally, the Food and Nutrition Service will also conduct two "pure cash-out" studies, one in Alabama and the other in San Diego County, California, where food stamp cash-out will be the only intervention. In these studies, households in each study site will be randomly assigned to cash or coupon groups to minimize any systematic effect of unmeasured factors on household expenditures and food consumption.

The Alabama cash-out study will be implemented in 12 randomly selected counties. In each county, food stamp households will be randomly assigned to receive either cash or coupon benefits. The total study sample across 12 sites will include 1,200 cash and 1,200 coupon households. This design affords a strong basis for assessing the household effects of cash-out (e.g., expenditures, food use, nutrient availability) by minimizing systematic differences between cash and coupon samples. In addition, it keeps the coupon system intact since less than 5 percent of the aggregate caseload across 12 counties will be cashed out. This is important for collecting valid comparison data from coupon recipients. The sampled counties represent urban and rural areas in all regions of the State which will enhance the generalizability of findings. The larger study sample will support statistical comparisons between urban and rural areas.

This evaluation is designed to focus on the recipient impacts of cash-out since food benefits constitute a larger portion of the total benefit package in

Alabama compared to most other States. On the other hand, assessment of cash-out effects requiring a program-wide implementation (e.g., program participation and administrative costs) will be limited in this evaluation.

The San Diego cash-out study will be conducted in two phases. The first will be based on an experimental design with random assignment of 20 percent of the caseload (approximately 7,000 households) to receive cash benefits. The reason that only this proportion will be initially cashed out is to maintain the coupon system integrity and thus provide a control group. Household data (e.g., expenditures, shopping patterns, and food use) will be collected from approximately 600 cash and 600 coupon recipients.

In the second phase, the entire county caseload will be cashed out, creating a condition of treatment saturation. At this point, administrative cost, program participation and retailer effects data will be collected and compared with data from the pre-implementation and Phase I periods.

Collectively, the four demonstrations will allow the Food and Nutrition Service to examine the effects of cash-out on:

- o total household expenditures by major budget categories
- o household food expenditures
- o household food use and nutrient availability
- o satisfaction with or preference for either cash or coupon benefits
- o program participation
- o administrative costs



- o food stamp benefit loss
- o impact on food retailers

Although each of the four demonstration projects will selectively examine the impacts described above, a common set of outcomes will be assessed across all sites. To maximize comparability, the Food and Nutrition Service developed core instruments to be administered at all sites.

The core instruments include a household survey and an administrative cost survey. With the exception of ASSETS, the three other studies will use the household survey instrument as presented here. ASSETS will not include the food use portion.

### **III. CORE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE**

#### **A. Development of the Survey Instrument**

In the early development of the draft instrument, the Food and Nutrition Service staff reviewed existing surveys that were designed to collect data similar to that being collected in this survey. The intent was to incorporate items and formats previously tested, approved and administered, into the core instrument. The surveys reviewed include: the Nationwide Food Consumption Survey (NFCS), Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals (CSFII), National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), Food Stamp Supplemental Security Income (SSI)/Elderly Cash-Out Survey, Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX), Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), and Current Population Survey (CPS).

To meet the study objectives, the following was identified as the essential data domains to be included in the Core Household Questionnaire:

- o household characteristics
- o household income
- o expenditures across major household budget categories (e.g., housing, transportation, food)
- o food purchasing patterns

- o food use by the households
- o preference for cash or coupon benefits

While some of the questions were taken directly from one or more existing instruments, others were modified by collapsing questions and/or response categories into fewer, higher-order groups. Table 1 indicates which instruments were used in developing specific survey items for each data domain. Generally, all the previously developed instruments were used in developing the questions for Part 1 of the survey instrument. The development of Part 2 relied heavily on Section II of the NFCS instrument. A preliminary draft instrument was developed by Food and Nutrition Service staff and presented to the Urban Institute and NORC for further development and refinement. Appendix 1 outlines the objectives of the household survey and the specific survey items that address each objective.

The process that the Urban Institute and NORC used to develop the final survey included reviewing the draft instrument provided by the Food and Nutrition Service, attending a presentation by HNIS and the Food and Nutrition Service staff on the usage of section II of the NFCS, field testing a draft of the final instrument and convening a technical panel to discuss outstanding issues in the development process. The technical panel included representatives from the Food Marketing and Consumption Economics branch of the Economic Research Service, the Division of Health Examination Statistics of the U.S. Department of Health and Human

Services, the Human Nutrition Information Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Census and the Division of Consumer Expenditure Survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Mathematica Policy Research and National Analysts staff also attended the technical panel meeting and contributed to the design of the final instrument. A request for approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was completed and and OMB clearance number was assigned to all the evaluations.

---

TABLE 1

SOURCE INSTRUMENTS OF SURVEY ITEMS BY DATA DOMAIN

<u>DATA DOMAIN</u>	<u>INSTRUMENTS</u>
Household member characteristics	CEX, CPS
Household member income/resources	
Employment	CSFII, NFCS, CPS
Income/resources	CEX, CPS, SIPP
Household expenditures by major budget categories	CEX, CPS
Household food expenditures	CSFII, NFCS
Household food supply and eating patterns	CSFII, NHANES, NFCS SSI/Elderly Survey
Experiences with Food Stamp Program	SSI/Elderly Survey

---

The final survey instrument consists of an orientation questionnaire and a household food use and income expenditures survey. The orientation questionnaire, used by the interviewer at the first in-person visit, contains a household enumeration roster with demographic questions about each household member and a few questions about shopping patterns. In the final development of the orientation questionnaire, the Washington State version is referred to as the screener.

The household food use and expenditures survey is divided into two parts. Part 1 includes questions on household composition, employment status, sources and amounts of income, food benefits, WIC benefits, household expenditures and opinions about the food benefits programs. Part 2 asks about household food use during the seven-day period between the orientation visit and the interview. This section begins with identifying the number of meals eaten by household members over the seven-day period and the number of meals and snacks served to guests from the home food supply. Following the meals section, each food used in the household over the previous seven days is identified, food category by food category. The amount used of each of these foods and the cost of food used is recorded.

The following discussion describes the major issues involved in developing the final core cash-out instrument.

**B. Issues Encountered in Development of Instrument**

The following describes the important issues encountered during the development of the household instrument. These include defining the study population, determining the data domains, and data collection methodology.

Definition of  
a Household

Many government programs, including the Food Stamp Program, target their benefits to the "household" unit. While a household used to be easily defined as a family unit living together, the increasing variation in peoples' living arrangements make it important to specify the unit of people one refers to when using the word household. For example, a household can be defined as all people living together or more specifically as people living together and sharing all expenses. A household could also be defined either as people living together and sharing a specific expense such as food or as people living together sharing a food supply, even if they do not share food expenses. The Food Stamp Program provides benefits for a household defined by an objective assessment of which people together share food purchase and food supply.

A household in the cash-out evaluations is defined as those people eating from the same food supply. Most of the questions in the survey are asked of all food stamp or food cash benefit household members--people living in the house who receive the same food stamp coupons or cash benefits as the respondent. However, when collecting income data, questions are asked about all people living in the same house regardless of whether or not they share food benefits or eat from the same food supply.

Collection of

There was much debate over whether food data for these evaluations should be collected

Food versus

Food Intake

Data

on the household level, as food use, or on the individual level as food intake. Household food use refers to the amount of food that is used by the household whether it be eaten, thrown away, or given to pets. Food that is leftover but not thrown away and food that is prepared and eaten away from the home is not included in food use data. Food use data measures nutrient availability. However, it is not a measure of dietary intake and thus can not be used to determine nutritional status. Household food use does not differentiate between the amounts eaten by different individuals within a household, but reports how much food has disappeared from the household food supply within a specified time period.

Food intake refers to the exact amount of food consumed. It does not include food leftover, thrown away or given to pets. It includes food consumed from any food source such as: a household's food supply, restaurants, friends, stores and vendors. Food intake does not provide adequate information on food availability since factors other than food availability may influence a person's food intake (e.g. lack of appetite, illness, time schedule). That is, if people are sick and have no appetite, or if people are busy and have no time to eat, food might be available in large quantities but food intake would be low. However, food intake measure provides more accurate information on the nutritional status of the individuals within a household, since it is collected from each household member separately. Nutritional status can then be determined by comparing the nutrient availability in the foods eaten to the Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDAs) which document the level of various nutrients needed by people according to their age and gender.



After reviewing the benefits of both food use and food intake measures, Food and Nutrition Service staff decided to collect food use data. The objective of the Food Stamp Program is to improve food availability for low income populations. Therefore, the objective of this study is to determine how a change in the Food Stamp Program, such as cash-out, will impact on the availability of food to Food Stamp households. As stated above, food use is a better measure of food availability than is food intake. Additionally, measurement of food intake requires collecting data at the individual level. For intake data to reflect an individual's actual intake, three days of data should be collected from each individual in the household. This is more costly and burdensome than collecting food use data at one visit with one household respondent. If all household members were to be interviewed, the respondent burden and cost of the survey would be overwhelming.

Household  
versus  
Individual  
Level  
Data

Although it is more costly and burdensome to collect data on an individual level, the advantages of individual level data were reviewed before a final decision was made to collect household level data. These advantages include increased accuracy of both in and out-of-home food use. All household members may not eat together, thus making accurate recall by one household representative more difficult. The designated household representative may not be aware of all purchases and foods used by each household member either in the home or away from home. However, given the high respondent burden and cost of collecting individual data, it was decided that data on household food use would be collected from one household representative.

Collecting

Cashing out food stamps provides households with greater flexibility in how

Data of Food  
Used Away  
From Home

they can spend their food benefits. Without the restrictions of coupons (for most people, coupons must be redeemed for unprepared food products from authorized food retailers), recipients might buy and eat a higher proportion of all meals away from home. The core household questionnaire is designed to collect some data on out-of-home food expenditures, but not to collect any information on the types or amounts of food eaten away from home. This omission disallows any conclusions to be drawn about total food or nutrient availability. This will limit the analysis of the food use data of some subpopulations, such as the homeless and elderly populations in San Diego, who are more likely to eat more meals away from home than are other subpopulations in the cash-out studies.

Although the Food and Nutrition Service staff was aware of this issue they decided that the only way in which to collect these data would be to create another module in the questionnaire. The development of such a module would have included a test of a new methodology and thus would have delayed the start-up date of the San Diego cash-out evaluation and program. Together with San Diego officials, the decision was made not to develop the extra module but to move forward with the project. Another influencing factor was that additions to an already lengthy instrument would greatly increase the respondent burden and the problems of non-response.

Time  
Reference  
Periods

Considerable thought was given to the time reference periods to be used in the survey. To maintain comparability with the National Food Consumption Survey, the food use questions necessitate a seven-day reference period. However, limiting the reference period to seven days for all survey questions

would give an incomplete picture of the household's overall income and expenditures. A consistent reference period across all income and expenditure questions was identified to decrease respondent burden, enhance recall and reduce chances that entire questions would be inadvertently answered using the wrong time period. The previous calendar month was selected as the reference period for all income and expenditure questions as it remains sufficiently fresh in the minds of respondents while encompassing a greater scope than the seven-day period. Moreover, most consumer bills are paid on a monthly basis. Asking income and expenditure questions about the previous year usually requires that the respondents multiply the average monthly figure by twelve months, thereby decreasing the reliability of the data. Income questions covering the previous calendar month may not accurately measure annual income, particularly for respondents whose income profile fluctuates greatly (such as farmers, migrant workers, and casual workers). However, the combination of income and expenditure questions, referenced to the same time period (last month), will provide a detailed profile of the prior month's fiscal activity.

Respondent

The questionnaire is designed to collect complete household level data on demographics, total

Burden

income, expenditures, opinions on food benefit programs, and food use. Despite all efforts to keep the survey concise, in order to obtain reliable data in each of the above areas, the survey remains lengthy. During the field test of the instrument the range for total questionnaire administration was between 62 and 254 minutes, with an overall average of 146 minutes (or approximately two and one-half hours). Section I took 41 minutes to administer and Section II took 107 minutes. To reduce the number of refusals resulting from the required length of the

interview, an incentive payment of \$20 will be provided to each responding household.

**C. Field Test of Draft Instrument**

In the fall of 1989 a field test of the household instrument and the accompanying survey procedures was conducted by NORC and the Urban Institute. The field test had three general purposes: to test the Core Household Food Use and Expenditure Questionnaire; to test the data collection procedures; and to experiment with different respondent incentives. The following section describes the field test, its findings and recommendations.

**Sample Design**  
**and**  
**Implementation**

Four classes of recipient households were of analytical interest. These included: families with reported income versus those without; single versus two-parent households, households receiving cash versus those receiving coupons, and households receiving incentive payment of \$15 versus those receiving \$25. The field test sample was drawn from the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) warrant rolls for the King South and Burien Community Service Offices (CSO) for the month of September, 1989. A completion of 40 interviews was targeted for the field test.

**Interviewer**  
**Selection and**  
**Training**

Interviewers were selected on the basis of their past experience, adaptability, and ability to master a complicated instrument within a short period of time.

Interviewers received three days of in-person training for the field test. The first day focused on the Screener and Section I of the questionnaire, the second day on Section II (food use) of the questionnaire and the third day included a wrap-up

mock interview and discussion of administrative matters. Material for the Food Use section of the questionnaire was presented to the interviewers by a USDA staff person experienced with the NFCS survey.

Data

Collection

Respondents were initially contacted by an advance letter sent by Washington State DSHS. This letter provided respondents with a brief introduction to the study, their importance in it, the voluntary nature of their participation, the assurance of confidentiality and the monetary incentive. Initial contact was to be made by telephone. The intent of this contact was to schedule an appointment with the respondent for the in-person screening visit. If respondents could not be located by telephone a personal visit was attempted. Due to the limited time frame allotted for the field test, extensive locating efforts were not undertaken. Since phone numbers were not available for a large portion of the field test sample, most respondents were contacted in-person by interviewers rather than by telephone.

The in-person screening visit was designed to: 1) gather selected household data that could be used to assess potential non-response bias for respondents who would participate in the screening visit, but not in the follow-up interview; and 2) show the respondent how to keep food use information for the second interview. The household food manager, the person in the household responsible for the majority of food shopping and food preparation, was identified during this visit and trained to keep records of the foods used in the seven day period between the screening visit and the interview. An appointment for conducting the interview was set for seven days later.

The second in-person interview was conducted with the food manager. The length of the interview was found to be dependent on: the quality of respondent record keeping, respondent reading skills, the number of interruptions and distractions, respondent's familiarity with the household food supply and purchases, household configurations in which more than one food supply/food purchase unit existed, and location of interview, i.e., proximity to kitchen.

Interviewers were instructed to field edit their completed interviews. The length of time this required was driven by the interviewers' ease with the instrument and the respondent's level of cooperation. Interviewer debriefings were held daily either individually or in small groups. A final group debriefing with field staff, field manager, research staff and the Food and Nutrition Service project officers was held at the end of the field effort.

Data

One of the objectives of the field test was to test the data collection procedures.

The field

Collection

test yielded 36 completed cases (both screener and questionnaire were

Results

completed) or 92 percent of the 39 scheduled appointments. The refusal rate appears to be consistent with comparable surveys of low income populations.

Respondent self-reporting indicated that the monetary incentive played a major role in respondent participation.

The range for total questionnaire administration time was between 62 and 254 minutes, with an overall average of 146 minutes (about two and one half hours).

Interviewers felt that respondents would have preferred less time for the interview

but that payments to respondents provided a strong incentive for completing the interview.

While specific questions were found to be sensitive, misleading or confusing to the respondent and the questionnaire layout did not provide enough recording space, the questionnaire generally performed as expected in the field test and subsequent revisions helped in reducing both respondent and interviewer burden.

Coding and

Coding and editing procedures were designed with the aim of preserving the evidence

and Data

of the questionnaire, interviewer, and procedural problems, while at the

Entry

same time generating an analyzable data set. Standard NORC coding and editing

Procedures

conventions were used, particularly for Sections I and III of the questionnaire.

Section II (Food Use) also drew on the "1987-88 Nationwide Food Consumption Survey (NFCS) Coding and Editing Manual" prepared by National Analysts.

Data preparation was a complex and time consuming task, with the amount of time required to code/edit Section II (Food Use) largely dependent upon the number of foods used by the respondent during the reporting period.

Problems were usually found to be due either to interviewer error (incorrectly skipped items) or questionnaire design (e.g., unanticipated answers reported, or not enough data entry columns allotted for amount of food bought and/or used).

The questionnaire design problems were more troublesome and time consuming to correct than interviewer errors.

Data entry was completed on NORC's key-to-disk system. The data entry operator worked from coded hardcopy questionnaires and there was 100 percent verification by a second (different) data entry operator. Coding/editing took an average of 1.75 hours per case and data entry required an average of 1.5 hours.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are the result of the field tests and are designed to provide ways to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the survey.

Up-dating sample eligibility. To minimize data collection costs and inefficiency associated with pursuing ineligible sample respondents, it is recommended that DSHS sample reflect up-dated eligibility status of all survey respondents following sample selection.

Timeliness of the advance letter. The positive results associated with the timely mailing of the advance letter and interviewer follow-up should be preserved. Interviewers should mail the advance letters to ensure their timely arrival prior to the initial interviewer contact.

Contents of advance letter. The advance letter/information sheet should provide respondents information about respondent program eligibility and exemption of the incentive payment from the income reporting requirements.

DSHS role in handling respondent calls and return mail. DSHS staff should continue to play an important role in facilitating survey activities. Select DSHS staff at the State and local level should be identified to handle respondent



inquiries and this select staff should work closely with NORC field staff to minimize respondent non-participation.

Minimizing telephone and field locating. To aid in time and cost efficiency respondent telephone numbers should be obtained from the CSO or welfare office and that the caseworkers at these offices verify respondent addresses.

Respondent incentive payments. Interviewers unanimously agreed that the respondent incentive payment was a crucial factor in gaining and maintaining respondent cooperation. Given the high respondent burden and the fact that the \$25 payment was most effective in gaining participation, a payment of at least \$20 is recommended for the entire survey.

Need for bilingual interviewers. The field test revealed the need for bilingual (and even multilingual) interviewers. A bilingual Spanish speaking interviewing staff will be required and a further investigation is recommended to determine the cost effectiveness of recruiting and hiring Asian-speaking interviewing staff.

Interviewer training. The length and complexity of the questionnaire suggest the need for extensive interviewer training. A comprehensive home-study program should be combined with the three day project-specific training implemented in the field test. This training should reflect the results of the field test.

Modifications to the screening instrument. Modifications to the screening instrument that reflect the questionnaire format were recommended along with a recommendation to incorporate more detail on the envelope left with the

respondent for tracking food uses during the seven day period. The final version of the screener reflects these suggestions.

Modifications to the core household questionnaire. The format of the field test questionnaire should be revised to provide more recording space and sufficient item labeling to highlight the importance of certain questions. The final version of the questionnaire reflects these suggestions.

Need for Spanish language instruments. In order to ensure standardization, a Spanish-language version of the advance letter, screener and questionnaire are recommended. This instrument was subsequently done under a separate contract.

**D. Sampling and Other Data Collection Issues**

The populations to be sampled comprise current food stamp recipients in the State of Washington, the State of Alabama and San Diego County. Exhibit A-1 in the introduction presents the salient characteristics of each evaluation design from which the sampling plans have been developed.

In the State of Washington, the population is defined as all public assistance recipients in the five FIP study sites receiving food benefits in the form of cash or coupons and all public assistance recipients in five comparison study AFDC sites receiving food stamp coupons June 1990.

In the State of Alabama, the population for the cash-out evaluation is defined as all food stamp recipients in study sites on or after the last day of June, 1990.

In San Diego County, the population is defined as all recipients of food stamps on or after the last day of February, 1990.

In Alabama ASSETS, the population for the evaluation is defined as all food stamp recipients in treatment and comparison sites as of a date yet to be determined.

Power analyses using means and standard deviations from the analyses of household food expenditures for the Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals indicated that a total sample of 1,200 cases (600 treatment and 600 control or comparison) would be needed to detect a seven to ten percent difference in household food expenditures (for food consumed at home), with 80 percent power at the 95 percent confidence level (two-tailed test of differences between means). This sample size represents the number of complete household interviews that will be needed to satisfy the stated statistical power requirements.

The basic sample design involves a random assignment of individuals who receive cash food benefits (treatment group) and a corresponding random assignment of individuals who receive coupons (comparison group). In all study sites the selection of individuals to participate in the survey sample is random. The following are the specific sampling plans for the Washington

State, Alabama Cash-Out and San Diego evaluations. A sampling plan for the Alabama ASSETS evaluation has not yet been developed.

Washington

State

In the State of Washington the sample of potential respondents and the randomized assignment of respondents to treatment and non-treatment groups involves a two stage sampling process. Prior to the first stage of sample selection, all of the Community Service Offices (CSOs) in the state were divided into four strata according to whether they were rural or urban and located in Eastern or Western Washington. Those strata with two or more CSOs that did not have Washington Employment Opportunities Programs (WEOP) were further subdivided by that dimension--if there was only one such CSO in a strata, it was eliminated. Within each substrata the sites were approximately matched on eight other criteria: rate of out-of-wedlock births, employment rate, average earnings of AFDC-Rs (cases with one parent, or two parents with one being incapacitated), AFDC-R caseload, ratio of AFDC-R to AFDC-E (two parent) cases, average AFDC-R grant per case, average earnings of all workers in service and retail employment (in the country), and monthly rate of retained placements in each WEOP unit.

Pairs of sites were randomly selected until a minimum annual caseload of 20,166 was reached. This produced the selection of five pairs of sites.

Once selections were complete, each site within each pair was then purposively assigned to an "A" or "B" group. The purpose of this assignment was to minimize (across five sites) the difference in total caseload between

the two groups. Random assignment was used to determine whether or not group "A" would become the "treatment" or the "non-treatment" group. Upon implementation of the Family Independence Plan in the treatment sites, all new-applicants at these sites would be assigned to the treatment group. However, participants who enrolled in AFDC and Food Stamps before FIP implementation at these sites were allowed to choose whether they would continue to receive food stamp coupons, or whether they would start receiving cash-benefits.

In the second stage of sampling, individuals within the five pairs of sample sites will be selected for the survey. The sample will be drawn proportionate to size by site-pair. Each public assistance food stamp recipient at a FIP site will be classified into one of three strata. In the first strata are all individuals who applied for public assistance after the FIP program was initiated at that site. In some sites this occurred in July of 1988, in other sites in October of 1988. Four hundred individuals will be chosen from this mandatory new-applicant participation strata. In the second strata are all individuals who were given a choice to participate in FIP, and declined. In the third strata are all individuals who were given a choice to participate in FIP, and accepted. One hundred and thirty-three individuals from each of the two nonmandatory strata will be selected. In total 666 individuals will be chosen from the FIP sites. This sample size is larger than the samples at other sites because it includes individuals who were given the opportunity but chose not to convert to the FIP program.

Each public assistance food stamp recipient at a control site will be classified into one of two strata. In the first strata are all individuals who applied for public assistance after the FIP program was initiated at the matching experimental site. Four hundred individuals will be chosen from this new-applicant strata. In the second strata are all individuals who were receiving public assistance before the FIP conversion date. One hundred and thirty-three individuals will be chosen from this strata. In total 533 individuals will be chosen from the non-FIP sites.

To obtain a final sample of 666 completed interviews from the treatment sites and 533 completed interviews from the non-treatment sites, each strata will be drawn with an oversample of 54 percent. Thus 205 households will be selected for each of the three 133 household strata, and 616 households will be selected for each of the two 400 household strata. It is anticipated that 10 percent of the initial sample will be ineligible for the study or unlocatable. Of the remaining 90 percent available respondents, the response rate is expected to be at least 75 percent. This estimate takes into account the pre-test results, response rates to previous NFCS data collections, and the incentive payments to be given to respondents.

The sample sizes of 400 new applicant, mandatory treatment and 400 new-applicant non-treatment households were selected using a criteria that we would be able to detect a 10 percent difference for the money value of food used between groups at a power level of 80 percent and a significance level of 5 percent. This means that there is only a 20 percent chance of failing to reject the hypothesis that cash-out makes no difference in the money value of

food used. This is true even when there is a difference of 10 percent or greater and a probability of less than 5 percent of erroneously asserting that a difference of any size exists. These calculations assumed that the coefficient of variation for the money value of food used, would be comparable to the coefficient of variation obtained for the 1977/78 NFCS where the sample mean was \$22.14 and the standard deviation was \$8.86. A sample size of 400 for each group will meet these criteria.

The sample sizes of 133 chosen for each of the three smaller strata, were chosen to assure that approximately 30 individuals who declined to participate in the FIP program, attributed that decision to their preference for food stamp coupons. Early reports of the reasons why AFDC recipients chose not to convert to FIP indicated that about 25 percent of these individuals said that they preferred coupons. Since individuals in this strata would be compared to the sample of individuals who decided to participate and to a comparable sample of AFDC Food Stamp recipients at the non-FIP sites, each of the remaining two samples were given the same sample size to maximize the efficiency of comparisons of means.

Overall sample design was based on the need to preserve sufficient sample sizes in the new-applicant mandatory participant samples based on simple comparisons of means, and at the same time be able to include sufficient numbers of individuals in the voluntary continuing participant cohorts to make inferences to the general target population in Washington State. A common problem in evaluating the impact of voluntary participation programs is that voluntary participants frequently do not have the same

response to the new policy initiatives as do mandatory participants. This is because voluntary participants choose the program that best satisfies their personal objectives. Controlling for the participation decision statistically requires many statistical assumptions that can be avoided in comparisons with mandatory participants.

The mixed sample design allows simple comparisons between mandatory cash food stamp benefit recipients and a comparable group of mandatory coupon recipients. However, by employing statistical modeling techniques which estimate how the characteristics of the individuals who chose FIP benefits differ from the characteristics of the individuals who chose to receive Food Stamp coupons, the range of the inferences may be extended.

San Diego  
County

The selection of sample cases in San Diego will be carried out in a single stage. San Diego officials are responsible for randomly assigning 20 percent of their caseload to a cash-out group. The sampling process will involve stratification of the population of recipients from both treatment and non-treatment groups into four strata on the basis of whether or not they receive public assistance (AFDC, Supplemental Security Income or General Assistance) and whether or not they receive earned income. Allocation of the sample to the four strata will be proportional to the number of cases within the strata. This will produce an equal probability sample. After cases have been stratified they will be randomly selected for inclusion in the study sample. There will be a total of 925 households selected each from the treatment and non-treatment groups, with a goal of obtaining a final sample size of 600 completed interviews in each of the groups.



Alabama -

Cash -Out

The sample design used in the State of Alabama makes use of two basic strata domains of study. These domains are food stamp recipients living in urban counties and food stamp recipients living in rural counties. As in the State of Washington, the selection of sample elements will be based on a two- stage sample design. The first stage involves counties and the second stage involves random selection of recipients within each county.

In the urban domain, two counties were randomly selected with probabilities of selection proportional to size. The selected counties are Jefferson and Montgomery. In the rural domain, a total of 10 counties were selected with probabilities proportional to size. The selected rural counties are Choctaw, Clay, Conecuh, Dale, Dallas, Dekalb, Fayette, Lauderdale, Marion, Pickens. For the urban domain, sub-stratification was based on size of urban areas (two sub-strata, large and medium). For the rural domains three sub-strata were defined on the basis of geographic location within the state: north, central and south.

The random assignment of individuals to treatment and non-treatment groups will be carried out on a within site (county) basis. In addition, samples within each site will be stratified by receipt of public assistance and earned income. Approximately 1,850 households across 12 sites will be selected for cash-out and constitute the treatment group. A stratified sample of approximately 1,850 coupon households from these sites will be contacted to collect comparison data.

The sample cases will be allocated to produce equal probability samples between urban and rural domains. In each domain, completed interviews will be collected from 600 cash and 600 coupon recipients. The final sample size of 1,200 urban and 1,200 rural households provides a power level for each domain equivalent to the level for the entire Washington or San Diego evaluation. This design allows for separate inferences for urban and rural areas as well as urban/rural comparisons. For the overall Alabama State analyses, urban and rural cases will be pooled together and will permit additional subgroup analyses and detection of statistically reliable differences less than 10 percent without compromising the power levels.

Alabama -  
ASSETS

The Alabama ASSETS evaluation will be conducted in six counties in the State, three treatment sites (Madison, Limestone, Clarke) and three comparison sites (Tuscaloosa, Chilton, and Butler). Selection of these sites was based on: (1) grouping each county in the State into urban, North/rural, or South/rural strata; (2) pairing counties in each group by similarities of caseload and social-economic characteristics; and (3) selecting the best matched pair from each stratum.

The entire Food Stamp Program caseload in three treatment counties will be cashed out. The final sample of 600 cash-out cases will be randomly selected from these sites with probabilities proportional to caseload. The same procedure will be used to select the final sample of 600 coupon recipients from the matched comparison sites. In addition, both the cash-out and

coupon samples will be stratified by variables such as presence of earned income and AFDC participation.

Sample

Attrition

A food stamp caseload is not static. Households enter and leave the food stamp program continuously. Sample attrition in a cross-sectional sample is the problem caused by the lag in identifying the sample and getting into the field to interview. Some of the respondents in the sample list will have left the Food Stamp Program, and other households who began participating in the Program after the sample list was drawn up will never have had an opportunity to be in the sample.

In Alabama, this problem was potentially quite severe. All households who were to receive cash-benefits were to be identified as of the end of March, 1990. On May 1, they began receiving cash-benefits. The client interviews will take place from August to mid-November to allow time for cash recipients to develop usual patterns of spending the cash food benefits. Some cash-out households will exit the program before they are interviewed.

To compensate for this sample attrition, a supplementary sample of recipients was drawn from the pool of new applicants, those households who start receiving benefits during April through September. These households will be sampled at a rate comparable to the sampling rate of the original cross-sectional households.

In Washington State and in San Diego, sample attrition is less of a problem because the lag between drawing the original sample list, and then getting

into the field will be between one and two months. In Washington State the population for inferential purposes will not be the average food stamp caseload in any case. To avoid problems in the voluntary nature of FIP for new clients, the sample will consist of recipients who applied after July 1988. The additional restriction of considering recipients who applied before June 1990, imposes insignificant analytic problems.

**E. Data Collection Plan**

Although there will be some minor differences in the data collection procedures in each site, the following plan for the Washington State evaluation serves as an example of how data collection will be conducted at all sites.

**Developing  
the Sample**

The Department of Social and Health Services will be given specifications for identifying survey-eligible food benefit recipients. A machine readable file will be produced for the purpose of sampling. Included will be: recipient name, recipient address, case number, earned income, number of parents in the household, family size, form of benefit received (cash vs. coupon), date of last issuance of food benefits, and date of last application for food benefits. Two samples will be drawn, one of food stamp recipients and one of cash benefit recipients.

Field testing indicated that computer file data used for developing the sample was less current than hard-copy recipient case file data. Some mailing addresses were either out-of-date or were Post Office boxes, and by the time a sample was developed and contacted, some recipients had left the program. One possibility for avoiding these problems would be to have the sampling information up-dated and verified at the local service offices. Ways in which this can be done without placing any burden on the local offices are currently being explored.

The final sample file will be used to generate mailing labels, personalized advance letters and sample labels. The "record of calls" form will contain a sample label which identifies the sampled food benefit recipient, the address, phone number and contractor-supplied case ID number. The screener form and the questionnaire will be supplied with a sample label containing the case ID number only. Survey field supervisors will distribute case folders to interviewers after all training has been completed.

#### Interviewer

#### Training

Prior to training, prospective interviewers will receive a home study packet. This packet will contain an interviewer manual, copies of all data collection forms, and home study instructions. Home study will take each interviewer approximately eight hours.

Interviewer training will be conducted over a three and a half day period.

The first day of training will cover the following:

- o the purpose and background of the study;

- o scheduling the mailing of advance letters;
- o telephone procedures for making appointments; and,
- o the protocol for screening and respondent training.

An introduction to the purpose and background of the study will be presented to the interviewers. The advance letter will be reviewed and interviewers will practice setting up mock schedules for mailing out such letters. After being introduced to the procedures and protocol for the initial telephone contact and visits, interviewers will work in small groups practicing these procedures.

The second day will be devoted to Section I of the questionnaire and the third day to Section II. Interviewers will have familiarized themselves with the questionnaires in their homestudy prior to the training. On the second and third days of training, interviewers will be walked through each item in the questionnaire and specifications will be presented as necessary. Particular attention will be given to critical items which will be identified by the Food and Nutrition Service. Interviewers will observe and participate in scripted mock interviews.

The final half day of training will cover administrative reporting and procedures for missing data retrieval. This level of training is necessary given the complexity and detailed nature of the survey instrument.

The initial interviewing assignments will be made to maximize the level of supervision and review. Experienced interviewers will be teamed with less experienced interviewers. The novice interviewers will be observed for their

first two interviews. These interviews will be reviewed by supervisors to determine if remedial training is necessary. Interviewers who do not demonstrate a satisfactory level of performance during training or interviewing will be released from service, and their cases reassigned.

Advance

Letter

In the field testing of the instrument, the advance letter on State stationery had a positive effect on gaining cooperation during field testing. Its timely arrival meant that the information was fresh in the respondent's mind. The letter's clarity minimized the need for lengthy explanations about the study.

Data collection will be conducted over a three month period. For this reason the interviewers will mail their own advance letters to insure timely arrival prior to the first contact. Advance letters will continue to be on State letterhead stationery. Interviewers will mail the advance letters seven to ten days prior to the first household contact. To expedite the initial portion of data collection, lead letters for the first week's assignments will be mailed seven to ten days prior to the end of interviewer training from the contractor's central office.

Locating

Procedures

Following the mailing of the advance letter, interviewers will attempt to locate the sampled household to make an appointment for the screening visit. The initial attempt will be via telephone using the number provided on the sample label. When no phone number is provided on the sample label or it is determined that the phone number is non-working, the interviewer will attempt to obtain a new number through directory assistance. In the absence of a viable phone number, the interviewer will locate the

recipient's household and conduct the screening and respondent training without a prior appointment.

In some instances the address shown on the sample label may no longer be current or no one is found at the given address after several attempted visits. In these cases, interviewers will use various established locating methods to find the sampled food benefit recipient. However, updated addresses and phone numbers to be provided from the DSHS offices should minimize the need for extensive locating activity.

Telephone  
Contact

The objectives of the initial telephone contact are to: (1) confirm that the sampled recipient resides in that residence; (2) identify the food manager for the household; (3) introduce the sampled recipient to the survey; (4) make an appointment for the initial screening visit with the household food manager and sampled recipient (if different); and, (5) obtain directions to the house. When phone numbers are not available, these same points are covered in the initial screening visit.

Initial Visit

During the screening visit the interviewer will confirm that the food benefit recipient resides at the address, identify the household food manager, and introduce or re-introduce the study. The respondent will then be asked to identify all persons who usually live in the household, their age, sex, and relationship to the food benefit recipient. A short series of questions regarding food purchase patterns will then be asked of the respondent. The purpose of these two sets of questions is to provide a means to assess non-



response bias for those who participate only for the screening phase of the survey.

The second half of the screening visit is to provide the respondent food manager with sufficient information regarding food use reporting that they may effectively keep food use records during the following seven day period. A large envelope will be given to the respondent in which to retain food labels and grocery receipts. In addition to the envelope, an instruction sheet will be provided to give examples of food use recording strategies. When the interviewer feels that the respondent understands the task, an appointment will be set for a minimum of seven days later to conduct the interview. The respondent is reminded of the incentive (\$20) which will be paid upon completion of the questionnaire. The interviewer is provided with a checklist (in the screener) which would ensure that all prescribed activities were covered during the visit.

#### Interview

The designated respondent will be the household food manager except where the food manager indicates that another household member would be able to provide more accurate information for other portions of the questionnaire. In these cases, both the food manager and the other respondent will be asked to provide information to complete the questionnaire.

#### Incentive

Respondents will be paid \$20 in the Washington, San Diego and Alabama

#### Payment

Cash-Out studies. The decision to offer an incentive payment was based on the length of the interview and the low response rate on the Nationwide Food Consumption Survey, the survey from which this household survey is

modeled. In field testing, the incentive greatly facilitated gaining cooperation during the initial screening, maintaining the interview appointment and completing the questionnaire. After testing incentive payments of \$15 and \$25, it was decided that a payment of \$20 is most appropriate. The use of incentive payment has not been finalized for the ASSETS evaluation in which only the first section of the instrument will be used.

**F. Training Materials**

The success of any survey depends on the quality of the interviewing staff-their skills, motivation and training. Due to the length and complexity of this survey, extensive interviewer training is necessary. All interviewers must participate in a three and one-half day training session after completing several hours of home study of the instruments and assorted interviewer materials. These materials include:

1. Introduction to the Instruments - a short overview of the assorted documents the interviewer will handle during the field period;
2. Administrative Specifications - a procedural manual which includes background of the survey, a step-by-step guide to field work and instructions on handling difficult cases and instructions on reporting procedures and completing administrative forms; and

3. **Question-by-Question Specifications** - a document that provides a clear understanding of the purpose of each item in the questionnaire.

Training will include a multifaceted approach to training using: lecture, demonstration, audio-visuals, mock exercises and homework assignments. Interviewers will work in both large and small groups as well as in pairs. Interviewers will be closely observed during training and will be expected to pass a "final exam" in the form of a mock interview before being deemed qualified to work on the survey.

**G. Data Processing and Conversion Software**

NORC developed programming specifications for cleaning and editing programs for the Household and Food Use Expenditure Survey. The specifications include range checks for each variable, character type specifications for each variable, logic checks (inter-item consistency) for selected variables, the list of critical items (items requiring retrieval if missing), and the minimum basic data set (items to be completed in order to assign the case a status of complete). Procedures are specified for handling missing and outlier data. These specifications are provided for the questionnaire, the screener and the record of calls form. The specifications are written at a level of specificity suitable for sharing with other contractors.

NORC has written the conversion and imputation software after receiving detailed input from the Food and Nutrition Service and HNIS regarding the specifications for each of the conversion and imputation items. The conversion software is used to convert the amount and cost information for

each food item used into nutritive values that are standardized. The conversion software will be tested by NORC and fully documented for use by other data collection organizations. The following assumptions have been made in planning the basic design concepts for the conversion software:

1. Programmed conversions for each food item include: computation of the dollar value, conversion quantities into pound weight equivalents, derivation of nutrient amounts from pound weight equivalents, determination of household size in terms of 21-meal equivalents, determination of household size in equivalent nutrient units (ENU), determination of the nutritive value per equivalent nutrient unit, and computation of the ratio of the nutritive value per equivalent nutrition unit to the RDA for the adult male.
2. Procedures and programs have been developed for handling missing and outlier values discovered or generated during conversion processing.
3. Procedures and programs have been developed for handling new foods.
4. Conversion will occur in batch mode after data entry and initial cleaning are completed.
5. Additional data editing and updates will be required as a result of conversion processing.

6. Data fields created by conversion processing will be uniform among subcontractors and consistent with NFCS data as specified in documentation provided by HNIS and the Food and Nutrition Service.
7. Weights conversion (household quantities to pound weights) will be a combined manual and automated activity.
8. Each contractor will develop a means for tracking the status and location of cases independent of the conversion software.

The work processing flow is as follows:

1. Hard copy questionnaires are first visually scanned to check that all key items are correctly entered. This is called scan edit.
2. Manual coding is performed.
3. Data are entered.
4. Data are cleaned.
5. Clean cases are processed through the conversion software in batches.
6. Exceptions (outliers, missing values in tables) are reported to the Food and Nutrition Service and/or the coding supervisor for resolution.

The conversion software consists of two major components: a micro-computer based look-up facility and a post data-entry batch process. The computer assisted look-up facility will be an aid to coders in referencing pound conversions factors for foods reported in unusual quantities not easily translatable into pounds. It will be accomplished through a readily available electronic text search utility (NORC's copyrighted askSam software) operating on the Weight Conversion Manual data. Each contractor will use their own electronic text program. NORC will provide the Weight Conversion data file in ASCII form. After data entry and cleaning, the conversion routines which look up and apply USDA codes, nutritive and relative values to questionnaire data will be performed. This process is a mainframe computing application running in batch mode. Identified missing and outlier values will be written to exception files which can be resolved manually. The planning programming language is PL/1 in Landem with the VSAM file access method.

As part of the testing of the conversion software, NORC and National Analysts engaged in a benchmark test which compared the performance of NORC's software with comparable software written by National Analysts. The test was conducted using four cases collected by NORC during the pretest. The two organizations worked closely to coordinate editing procedures to ensure that the benchmark test would evaluate software calculations and not pre-data entry procedural differences. National Analysts sent to NORC the output files resulting from processing the pretest cases. NORC then processed the four cases and compared the two sets of output files case by case and variable by variable. Differences noted were discussed

with the Food and Nutrition Service. Modifications to NORC's software were made as a result. Remaining calculation differences (occurring for the most part in the third decimal place) appear to result from differences in hardware environments (mainframe processing vs PC processing). Adjustments will be made to eliminate these differences. The best method of adjustment is currently under discussion with the Food and Nutrition Service and will be fully implemented prior to processing any data from the evaluation surveys.

The data from the Weights Conversion Manual was entered to create a weights table. This table has approximately 4302 entries with varying numbers of conversion factors associated with each entry. Data entry specifications were written with input from the Food and Nutrition Service.

#### **H. Quality Assurance Procedures**

In preparation for the data collection and data processing tasks, quality assurance procedures were developed as follows:

##### **Field Edit**

Following the completion of each interview, the case will be thoroughly reviewed by the Field Interview (FI) who completed the case. His or her task is to look at all recorded responses, paying special attention to critical items, to determine if the data are complete, legible and follow the logic of the questionnaire. Missing or unclear responses will be corrected or followed with a phone call or re-visit with the respondent.



<u>First Cases</u>	The first two cases of each interviewer's (FI's) work will be sent to her/his Field
<u>- Field</u>	Manager(FM). FI's are not permitted to continue work until the first two cases
<u>Manager Edit</u>	have have been edited by their FM. These cases will be reviewed following the same procedures as described in the field edit. Minor errors found will be reported to the FI and corrections made. Cautionary comments and suggestions for the prevention of future errors of the sort found will be made by the FM. Serious errors, critical items, etc., will prompt remedial training and FM review of the next set of completed questionnaires. Questionnaires demonstrating incompetence or gross negligence of interviewer duties will prompt the dismissal of the interviewer.
<u>Data Receipt and Scan Edit</u>	As completed cases are received at the central office, they are subjected to a scan-edit, batched and recorded as received in the electronic Survey Management System (SMS). When each packet is opened, the contents of the packet will be checked against an enclosed transmittal sheet. Missing items will prompt a call to the interviewer to determine the disposition of identified missing items. When all case-related packet items are accounted for, the questionnaires will receive a scan-edit. The variables that are scanned at this juncture are those whose absence would inhibit tracking of the case through the editing-keying-cleaning process. Such variables would include case ID number and final result code. Cases passing the scan edit will be logged as received in the central office. Logging of the case primes the SMS for tracking the status of each case through the editing-keying-cleaning process.

### Coding

Two teams of coders will be utilized. One team will specialize in Sections I and III of the questionnaire. The other team will specialize in the coding of Section II, the food use section. Because the questionnaire is long and the relationship of variables is intricate, a two team approach will reduce the length of the learning curve for each section of the questionnaire.

One hundred percent of each coder's first batch will be checked by coding supervisors. Two of the supervisors have been extensively involved in the development of the questionnaire and the software for data conversion of the food use data. Errors found in the first batch will prompt remedial training tailored to the type of errors found. Thereafter, ten percent of each coder's daily work will receive quality assurance checking.

Interviewer errors found will be recorded and transmitted electronically to the appropriate FM to include retrievable missing data. Updates and corrections from the field will be sent electronically to the coding shop. Some errors in Section II may be transparent to the coders until they become completely conversant with the intricacies of the food variables. Data conversion error reports will be produced which will identify the case ID and each error detected. Editors will manually retrieve these cases, reconcile the errors and submit the corrections for data entry. Unresolvable errors and foods not contained in the master food list will be submitted to FNS for advisement.

### Data Entry

All data will be 100 percent verified. This procedure ensures that keying errors do not confound the error detection routines in machine edit or data cleaning.

## **Data Cleaning**

The data cleaning software specifications are described in more detail elsewhere in this report. However, the software will produce error logs on a case and variable basis. The logs will be routed to the edit staff for error reconciliation. Corrections will be made to the case record and resubmitted to data cleaning programs in an iterative process.

### **I. Data Analysis Plan**

The core household survey is designed to measure the impact of cash-out on household food expenditures and nutrient availability, and the attitudes toward the two forms of food benefits, cash and coupons. Among outcome measures established by the Food and Nutrition Service are:

- o Food expenditures
- o Food use
- o Nutrient availability
- o Share of food expenditures as a portion of total expenditures
- o Participation in other food assistance programs
- o Food shopping patterns

- o Changes in the quality and quantity of food used from household's food supply
- o Perceptions about the advantages and disadvantages of food checks and coupons
- o Stigma of program participation
- o Check-cashing experience of cash-out households

By contrasting the experiences of cash-out and coupon households, the Food and Nutrition Service can determine the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two systems of benefit distribution.

**Data Analysis**

**Techniques**

**Based on**

**Sample**

**Comparisons**

In order to explore hypotheses regarding food expenditures, food use, nutrient availability, food expenditure shares, participation in other food assistance programs, and food shopping patterns, the distribution of sample outcomes for cash-out households will be compared to the distribution of sample outcomes for coupon households. Because of the sampling design, household characteristics, other than the type of food benefit received, are intended to be similar. Differences outside of random sample differences between the cash-out and coupon households should be largely attributable to differences in the benefit form. In Washington State, where a matched site design is employed, other differences may be induced by differences in the caseloads at the different sites.

There will be three major approaches used to measure the difference in outcomes--averages, ranks and regression analysis. Statistical significance tests will be employed in all cases. The different approaches have different strengths and weaknesses.

Comparison of sample averages is often employed to evaluate experimental treatments. The technique can be very efficient at detecting additive differences when the variables are normally distributed, that is distributed according to the familiar bell-shaped curve. For example, if food expenditures for coupon households tend to be \$5.00 more per week than cash households, then the difference in the two sample averages should be very close to \$5.00. The difference in the sample averages can be accurately extrapolated to other cash-out experiments.

Tests which are able to detect smaller differences between the coupon and cash-out households, are possible when other household characteristics that influence food expenditures are accounted for. Even though the distribution of household characteristics such as employment, earned income, number of children and marital status, should all be similar for the coupon and cash-out households, there will be some differences. These differences partially mask the real impact of the different benefit forms. As a result the analysis is more efficient when sample outcome averages are adjusted for differences in other household characteristics. Comparison of regression adjusted sample averages relies on a more restrictive set of statistical assumptions than does a comparison of unadjusted sample averages so that the more sophisticated

technique cannot be assumed to be entirely superior. Therefore both adjusted and unadjusted sample means will be compared.

Finally, differences in outcome measures will be evaluated using non-parametric tests. Previous food use studies have documented that many different types of food outcome measures are non-normally distributed. For example, instead of being normally distributed, nutrient values, such as in the case of Vitamin A, may have many very low values and a few exceptionally high values. The random incidence of a few more carrots in the cash-out households can entirely reduce or reverse inferences in the estimated mean-effects of cash-out on Vitamin A nutrient availability. The Mann-Whitney test for comparison of ranks provides a method less sensitive to few extreme values than a comparison of means.

Indexing

Household

Food

Measures

Household size, household composition, and the number of meals eaten at home, strongly influence household food expenditures, food use, and nutrient availability. Households which are larger, tend to purchase more food and therefore spend more on their groceries. To compensate for the random differences between the samples in household composition, food outcome measures will be scaled by a physiologically based household composition index.

Detailed food use data will be collected only for food used at home. It is quite likely that the food manager who is answering the questionnaire will not

know what other household members have eaten away from home.

Therefore, a standard household food use survey is not used to examine food used away from home. To adjust for random and nonrandom differences in the proportion of meals eaten away from home, an index employing the number and type of meals eaten at home and away from home, and the nutrient requirements of the persons eating from the food supply will also be used to scale the value of food used at home, and the household nutrient availability.

**Data Analysis**

**Techniques**

**Based on**

**Sample**

**Summaries**

Not all the outcome measures in the cash-out study lend themselves to analysis by comparing the cash-out and coupon households. Variables such as changes in the quality or quantity of food, perceptions of clients about coupon and cash benefits, and food expenditure budgeting all are expected to differ when comparisons are made between the samples. Comparisons between the cash-out and coupon sample responses, don't reveal any useful behavioral differences. Therefore these data will simply be summarized and reported.

**Econometric**

**Estimation**

**of Food**

**Expenditures**

The Food and Nutrition Service has established that a primary objective of the cash-out evaluations is to determine the impact of cash-out on food expenditures. The value of money used at home and reported expenditures on food away from home, will be the focus of the major econometric modeling. Models of food expenditures both home and away-from home will be estimated, with adjustments for: zero expenditures, for differences in employment, earnings, program participation, and household composition.

Analysis will be conducted with the form of benefit fully interacting with all other variables in the model and adjustments for nonlinearity.



#### **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE COST INSTRUMENT**

State agencies routinely estimate the cost of performing administrative tasks for the Food Stamp Program to calculate appropriate levels of federal reimbursement. These data are compiled and submitted to the Food and Nutrition Service. The data on the forms submitted to the Food and Nutrition Service are often imprecise, aggregate costs across many different activities, and are difficult to analytically verify. The supporting Management Information System (MIS) data are broken down by many different activities and are largely state specific.

In cost evaluations of experimental programs it is necessary to control for costs and problems specific to the evaluation. The implementation of new programs often results in significant one-time costs. While these costs are not present in Washington State, because Washington State cash-out was embedded in a larger AFDC reform, they can be an important source of measured and reported costs for San Diego and Alabama. Data analysis, and analytic design appropriate for isolating these costs was required and not present under the existing state data systems.

Both Washington State and Alabama implemented a system where food stamp coupons and food checks are issued in the treatment sites. In handling checks or coupons there is a fixed cost for many activities. When there are fixed costs, average costs decrease quickly with increasing number of cases.

The net result is that cost analysis that can be applied to different cash-out designs requires data collection that identify fixed costs separately from variable costs.

Finally, each of the three administrative jurisdictions involved in cash-out demonstrations, Alabama, San Diego, and Washington State, have different MIS systems. The different data structures and cost assumptions underlying each structure made a common method of cost-evaluations, based on MIS, impossible.

**A. Study Objectives and Variables**

One of the expected advantages of replacing food stamp coupons with cash is that a check based system would provide benefits to clients with much greater efficiency. Coupons are easily negotiable items; they can be exchanged, stolen and sold. Therefore the Food and Nutrition Service has instituted standard procedures to contain the amount of fraud and abuse. For example, in Washington State, over two-thirds of the coupons are distributed through a Food Coupon Authorization (FCA) system. In this system, families receive FCAs in the mail, and then must go either to a welfare office or to an eligible post office to receive their coupons. The food stamp recipient then takes the book of coupons to the retailer, shows special ID, and then purchases food. The retailer redeems the coupons at their bank which then ships the coupons and accompanying documentation to the Federal Reserve branch bank where their account is credited, and where the coupons are inspected and destroyed.

All along the way the negotiables must be checked and rechecked to prevent fraud and abuse.

A cash-out program replaces the FCA or alternative mail issuance of coupon books with a mailing of a single check to the recipient. The recipient then uses his or her standard method to cash or deposit the check. Since all state governments issue public assistance checks, automated systems of printing, mailing, and reconciling benefit checks are well developed. It is thought that problems due to loss, theft and replacement are also less common than in other systems. The simpler system is thought to result in less administrative effort. The purpose of the cash-out administrative cost survey is to evaluate these perceived cost savings. Specific objectives and variables are presented in Appendix 2.

The differences in costs are not entirely one-sided. Printing, distribution, and mailing costs may decrease but do not disappear. Although the largest costs in the FCA system, paying staff who redeem FCAs for coupons and who control coupon inventories, seemingly disappear, in reality they do not. Instead recipients who pay charges for check cashing privileges pick up the cost of private staff who perform the same function for checks. In systems of coupon distribution with large fixed costs, cost savings may be quite small, as long as a parallel system of coupons is maintained. In the extreme, where relatively few recipients are cashed out in a local site, maintaining two systems may result in higher costs.

Review of  
EBT System

Another alternative to coupon issuance system evaluated by the Food and Nutrition Service is a debit card system known as electronic benefits transfer (EBT). The chief advantage of a debit card system is that, like coupons, purchases using a debit card can be restricted to food purchases alone. In 1984 and 1985 the Food and Nutrition Service, the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Planning Research Corporation, and Abt associates together conducted an evaluation of EBT system. As cost was perceived as a major reason for considering EBT, very detailed and functional information was gathered on administrative costs for both coupons and electronic transfers. The statistics generated from the EBT study served as a guideline in development of the cash-out administrative cost evaluations. In particular, they disclosed the size of relative costs.

There are two common forms of coupon distribution, the ATP system and a direct mail system. In the first, the ATP system, recipients receive a food stamp authorization form, known variously as an "Authorization to Participate", an "ATP", a "Food Coupon Authorization" or a "FCA". The recipient takes the ATP to the welfare office or other transaction office and receives coupons in exchange.

In a direct mail system the coupons are mailed to the recipient directly. Because of the relative size of the envelopes and their consistent labeling, coupon envelopes are easy to recognize. Not surprisingly, many coupons are stolen and sold. Households at risk for mail loss receive benefits in the form of ATPs, households at less risk receive benefits by direct mail.

The largest source of costs in ATP coupon issuance system is the fee paid to banks for undertaking the transaction of coupons for the Authorization to Participate cards, ATP. In the Reading, Pennsylvania demonstration this cost was \$1.10 per transaction. The next largest cost is that incurred in authorizing, printing, and mailing ATP cards. This cost was \$.73 per case per month.

The next largest source of costs in the Reading evaluation would be common to both direct mail and ATP recipients. This cost is the cost incurred in recycling the coupons after the recipient has used them to buy food. These costs per food stamp case per month are \$.14 for crediting retailers, \$.14 for insuring retailer compliance, and \$.21 for coupon reconciliation, for a total of \$.50.

The fourth largest source of costs in Reading also would be common to both direct mail and ATP recipients, and that cost was the cost in coupon printing and storage. In the EBT study this was estimated to be \$.24 per case per month. The remainder of costs, are those costs associated with ID issuance and coupon delivery, and together they were estimated as \$.19 per case per month.

#### **B. Development of Instrument**

The administrative cost survey has been developed to serve as a model for all cash-out evaluations, but the detail is focused on the Washington State evaluation. The other evaluations will use this survey approach but will

modify it to reflect the site variations in food stamp issuance procedures. For example, San Diego uses a mail issuance system for distributing food assistance benefits while Washington State uses both a mail system and an ATP system. Thus, the San Diego instrument will be similar to the Washington State instrument but will not ask any questions about the ATP system. The instrument included in this package assumes that, prior to the data collection phase, interviewers for each evaluation will develop a working knowledge of the cash and coupon issuance systems by reviewing written materials provided by the appropriate Federal, State and local agencies. A complete list of activities and tasks pertinent to each separate evaluation will be developed prior to data collection. Such a list will include the following:

- o Key activities in the food benefit issuance process;
- o Individuals, contracts or equipment that are primarily devoted to food benefit issuance systems;
- o How long an activity takes/how often it occurs;
- o The time an individual spends in issuance related activities; and
- o The costs of all personnel and other resources.

Two different surveys have been developed—one to be used with Food Stamp Program personnel and one to be used with FIP personnel. They are identical except for differences appearing in some of the issuance activities particular

to each program. The survey is designed to allow respondents to skip sections for which they have no information. The five sections in the survey are: (1) Introduction and Personal Data; (2) Activity Verification; (3) Task and Staff Identification and Labor Time; (4) Time Use of Staff; and (5) Nonlabor Costs. Section Three consists of worksheets which outline the tasks involved in each issuance activity. The list of activities and tasks on each worksheet will reflect an understanding of the issuance system developed from preliminary discussions with Federal, State and local personnel and a review of pertinent written materials.

Respondents to the administrative cost survey will include State and local site personnel. At the State level this will include management personnel, supervisors and lead workers. Local site respondents will include financial and clerical supervisors and lead workers.

#### **C. Data Collection Plan**

Before conducting any interviews the appropriate State personnel will be contacted to obtain permission for interviewing State employees. This contact will be initially made by telephone and followed-up with a written request. State personnel will be asked to identify the staff who would be appropriate respondents for the study. Respondents will be selected so that at least one respondent is familiar with each of the State or local food benefit authorization, issuance, redemption or reconciliation activities. Written

descriptions of the study purposes and the interview process will be provided to respondents.

Management-level respondents identified by the State will be contacted, introduced to the study and asked to participate. An interview time will be set up and they will be asked to gather documents for the interviewers to review prior to the interview. Each respondent will be sent a description of the study and the interview procedures and a written request for appropriate documents.

Respondents will be asked to send or otherwise make available to the interviewers the following: (1) a personnel list or chart with personnel grades for everyone in the office involved in issuance activities; (2) routinely prepared food benefit or FIP warrant reports or documents; (3) office of workload analysis documents for the past three months; and (4) information on other direct costs.

All respondents will be identified by State personnel or local supervisory staff prior to being interviewed. All interviews will be conducted in person at the respondent's office. Interviews will be conducted individually with each respondent. If during the course of the interview it becomes apparent that the respondent does not have sufficient information to respond, the interviewer will request another respondent.

#### **D. Data Analysis Plan**



Our plans for the analysis of the impact of cash-out on the costs of administering the Food Stamp Program are described below. Principal hypotheses are presented first, followed by a description of the methods to be used for the analyses of administrative costs at the local, state and federal levels.

Following are the principal hypotheses and subhypotheses that will be tested in the study of the impact of cash-out on the costs of administering the Food Stamp Program.

1. Lower local administrative costs associated with cash rather than coupon issuance combine with little difference in state-level costs to produce a net saving
  - a. Cash-Out reduces the costs of authorizing access to benefits
  - b. Cash-Out reduces the costs of storing and transporting and related security costs
  - c. Cash-Out reduces the costs of delivering benefits to participants
  - d. Cash-Out reduces the costs of dealing with issuance problems and replacing benefits
  - e. Cash-Out reduces the costs of required program monitoring and reporting

2. Total federal costs of administering the Food Stamp Program are lower under the check than coupon-based system
  - a. Cash-Out reduces the costs of printing coupons and transporting them to state agencies
  - b. Cash-Out reduces the costs of authorizing and monitoring participating retail stores
  - c. Cash-Out reduces the costs of redeeming coupons through the Federal Reserve System
  - d. Cash-Out reduces the costs of system-level program monitoring and reporting

In addition, staffing and other resource-use patterns for specific aspects of the issuance and redemption process under the two issuance systems will be examined and differences identified. Data collection plans under FIP for state and local administrative cost data are described in the OMB review package submission for the cash-out evaluation survey instruments. Data collection plans for San Diego and Washington State projects are described in the detailed analysis plans of the respective evaluation plans.

The general outline of the data-collection procedures is similar in the three sites. Cost data will be collected by interviewing state and local officials.

Cost data for check issuance and coupon issuance systems will be separately analyzed by function. Functional categories will include: Authorizing access to Benefits, Delivery of Benefits to Recipients, Printing and Storing Coupons, Crediting Retailers for Purchases, Reconciliation and Monitoring, Managing Retailer Participation.

In San Diego and Alabama, project design and implementation costs will be broken out separately and analyzed separately. Since cash-out is entirely embedded in the FIP program, implementation costs in Washington State were unidentifiable. In Washington State, issuance costs will be separately estimated for different levels of cash-out, a partial site cash-out, a state-wide AFDC client cash-out, and a statewide total cash-out, based on the evaluation of the partial cash-out experience.

A full comparison of costs between a coupon issuance system and a check issuance system requires estimates of federal-level costs. These costs include those associated with: (1) printing and storing food coupons; (2) crediting retailers for coupons through the Federal Reserve System; (3) monitoring coupon redemption at the Agriculture Department's Minneapolis data processing facility; and (4) managing retailer participation in the program. All of these costs would be essentially eliminated by a full implementation of check-issuance, and it is important to estimate their magnitude in order to estimate the full effects of cash-out on government costs. Assuming it is possible for the Food and Nutrition Service to provide information about the average costs per issuance of these federal-level functions these costs will be combined with the estimated local-level savings and state-level costs due to

cash-out in order to develop comprehensive estimates of the potential costs savings which could be achieved from cash-out.

## REFERENCES

- Blanchard, L., Butler, J.S., Doyle, P., Jackson, R., Ohls, J.C., Posner, B.M. (1982). Final report: Food Stamp SSI/elderly cashout demonstration evaluation. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Hamilton, W.L., Bartlett, S.H., Fisher, S.D., Hoaglin, D.C., Kane, C.D., Logan, C.W., Marschall, T.R. (1987). The impact of an electronic benefit transfer system in the Food Stamp Program. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.
- Mathematica Policy Research (1985). Evaluation of the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, Volume I: Environment, participation, administrative costs, and program integrity. Princeton, NJ: Author.

**APPENDIX 1**

**STUDY OBJECTIVES AND VARIABLES  
FOR THE HOUSEHOLD SURVEY**

## Household Survey Objectives

### Variable List

Objectives	Item	Item Description
<u>General Information</u>		
	Section I	
	I. 1A	Recipient/household roster
	I. 1B	Sex
	I. 1C	Age
	I. 1D	Relationship to recipient
	I. 1E	Marital status
	I. 1F	Racial affiliation (recipient only)
	I. 1G	Education level (recipient only)
	I. 2A	Activity last week (14 +)
	I. 2B	Hours worked
	I. 2C	Type of employment-training activity
	I. 2C1	List of HH members in employment-training activity
	I. 2C2	Number of hours in employment-training activity
	I. 3	Income sources:
	3A	wages or salary
	3B	AFDC, ADC or FIP
	3C	general or other private or public charitable assistance
	3D	Social Security
	3E	Supplemental Security Income
	3F	Veteran's Benefits (x-GI Bill)

General Info.

3G	Unemployment or Workers Comp
3H	Housing Assistance
3I	retirement benefits (x-Social Security)
3J	alimony
3K	child support
3L	foster child care
3M	other income - estates, trusts, paid up life insurance, dividends, interest, scholarship, GI Bill, educational grants & living expenses
3N	payments - roomers/boarders or rent
3O	business or professional practice
3P	farm
3Q	other sources: insurance, tax refunds, contributions & gifts, prizes, royalties & other unusual cash receipts.
3A-Q1	List of HH member who receives income from listed source
3A-Q2	Amount of income from listed source
I. 4	Recipient of food assistance
I. 4A	Persons covered by food assistance
I. 4B	Total amount of last month's check
I. 4C	Date of most recent check/stamps
I. 4C1	Dollar amount for food
I. 5A	Pregnant females
I. 5A1	List of pregnant females



General Info.(cont.)

I. 5B	Breast feeding
I. 5B1	List of prgnant females
I. 6	WIC recipient
I. 6A	WIC recipient
I. 6B	List of persons WIC covers
I. 6C	Amount of last voucher
I. 7	Introduction
I. 13B	Receive Energy Assistance
I. 13B1	Amount of Energy Assistance
I. 14	Contribute to HH expenses (not covered by food stamps)
I. 14A	Amount contributed
I. 14B	Contribution of income in kind
I. 32	Total money for HH

---

## Objective # 1:

Assess the Effects of Cash Benefits on household Non-Food Expenditures

I. 8	Type of housing expense
I. 9	Amount of rent paid
I. 10	Is it public housing?
I. 11	Amount of mortgage payment
I. 11A	Property taxes separate from mortgage (last month)
I. 11B	Amount of property taxes
I. 11C	Home insurance payment separate from mortgage
I. 11D	Amount of insurance payment
I. 12	Property taxes (last month)
I. 12A	Amount of property taxes

Objective #1 (cont.)

I. 12B	Home insurance payment
I. 12C	Amount of insurance payment
I. 13	Utility expenses (last month)
I. 13A1-8	Amount of payment for:  electricity gas other heating fuels water sewer garbage collection telephone other utilities
I. 15	Payments for medical services
I. 15A	Amount of payment for medical services:
I. 15A1-16	hospital room hospital services doctor services eye exam and treatment dental care prescription drugs supportive & convalescent equipment general medical equipment medical or surgical equipment rental services (non-doctor) lab tests & x-rays care in convalescent or nursing home nursing services & therapeutic treatments Health insurance payments other medical expenses
I. 16	Transportation expenses
I. 16A1-8	Amount of payment for:  buses & trains taxicabs car payments car insurance car repair & maintenance gasoline parking/car pool other transportation costs

Objective #1 (cont.)

I. 17	Clothing & shoe expenses
I. 17A	Amount of clothing & shoe expenses
I. 18	attendance at day care or babysitter
I. 18A	Pay. for day care or babysitter
I. 18B	Amount paid for day care or babysitter
I. 18C	Number in child care
I. 24	School related expenses
I. 24A	Total of school related expenses
I. 25	Any school related expenses not covered in Q. I. 24A
I. 25A	Specify expenses
I. 25B	Amount of school related expenses (x-Q. I 24A)
I. 26	Pay day care for elderly or disabled adult
I. 27	Expenses for children not living in household
I. 27A	Amount of expenses for children not in household
I. 28	Recreational expenses
I. 28A	Amount of recreational expenses
I. 29	Recreational expenses (x-food) not covered in Q. I.28A
I. 29A	Specify expenses
I. 29B	Amount of recreational expenses (x- Q. I. 28A)
I. 30	Vacation travel expenses
I. 30A	Amount of vacation travel expenses
I. 31	Personal services
I. 31A	Cost for personal services

---

Objective # 2:

Assess the Effects of Cash Benefits on Household Food Expenditures, Use, and Nutrition Availability

- |        |   |
|--------|---|
| I. 19  | Enrolled in day care w/ meals or snacks paid for separately |
| I. 19A | Amount paid for day care meals or snacks                    |
| I. 20  | Any HH member in grade K-12 (filter Q. I. 20)               |
| I. 21  | School attendance w/ complete breakfast or lunch            |
| I. 21A | Which meal served   |
| I. 22  | Total school breakfasts (last month)                        |
| I. 22A | Free, reduced or regular price                              |
| I. 22B | Amount paid school breakfasts (last month)                  |
| I. 23  | Total hot lunches (last month)                              |
| I. 23A | Free, reduced or regular price                              |
| I. 23B | Amount paid school lunches (last month)                     |
| I. 33  | Out of home meals or snacks (7 days)                        |
| I. 33A | Cost of out of home meals (tax, tips, drinks)               |
| I. 34  | Ready-to-eat meals, carry-out, "fast-food" (7 days)         |
| I. 34A | Cost of ready-to-eat, carry-out "fast food" (tax & drinks)  |
| I. 35  | First foods benefits received                               |
| I. 35A | Cash or stamps  |
| I. 36  | Describe food eaten (last month)                            |

Objective #2 (cont.)

- I. 37 Days without food and money or stamps to buy food
- I. 38 Skip meals due to lack of food or money/stamps to buy food (last month)
- I. 38A # days (last month)
- I. 38B # days (last week)

Section II:

- II.2A Meals eaten from Household food supply (listed by household member) during reference period
- II.2B Meals bought and eaten away from home during reference period
- II.2C Meals eaten away from home not requiring payment during reference period
- II.2D Total number of meals eaten during reference period
- II.3 Did any guests eat meals in household during reference period
- II.3A Number of male guests eating meals in household during reference period
- II.3B Number of female guests eating meals in household during reference period
- II.3C Number of male/female guests in following age groups (under 12, 12-18, 19-50, 51 or older)
- II.3D Total number of morning, noon, evening meals eaten by each age/sex group
- II.4 Did any guests eat snacks in household during reference period
- II.4A Number of male guests eating snacks in household during reference period
- II.4B Number of female guests eating snacks in household during reference period
- II.4C Number of male/female guests in following age groups (under 12, 12-18, 19-50, 51 or older)

Objective #2 (cont.)

II.4D	Total number of snacks eaten by each age/sex group
II.4E	Of total number of snacks how many were light snacks eaten by each age/sex group
II.A+B1	Use of BABY FOOD during the reference period
II.A+B2	Use of BABY FOOD CATEGORY during the reference period
IIA+B3	Use of NUMBERED BABY FOOD ITEM during the reference period
IIA+B4	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED BABY FOOD ITEM during the reference period
IIA+B5	Source of the NUMBERED BABY FOOD ITEM
IIA+B6	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED BABY FOOD ITEM during the reference period
IIA+B7	Amount paid for NUMBERED BABY FOOD ITEM
IIA+B8	Is amount paid the total price
IIA+B9	What price given represents (whether per pound or per ounce)
II.C1	Use of BEEF, PORK, VEAL, LAMB during the reference period
II.C2	Use of MEAT CATEGORY during the reference period
II.C3	Use of NUMBERED MEAT ITEM during the reference period
II.C4	The form that the NUMBERED MEAT ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.C5	Did the NUMBERED MEAT ITEM have a bone
II.C6	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED MEAT ITEM during the reference period
II.C7	Source of the NUMBERED MEAT ITEM

Objective #2 (cont.)

II.C8	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED MEAT ITEM during the reference period
II.C9	Amount paid for NUMBERED MEAT ITEM
II.C10	Is amount paid the total price
II.C11	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.D1	Use of POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT during the reference period
II.D2	Use of POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT CATEGORY during the reference period
II.D3	Use of NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM during the reference period
II.D4	The form that the NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.D5	Did the NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM have a bone
II.D6	Was the NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM ready to cook or not ready to cook
II.D7	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM during the reference period.
II.D8	Source of the NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM
II.D9	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM during the reference period
II.D10	Amount paid for NUMBERED POULTRY, GAME, ORGAN MEAT ITEM
II.D11	Is amount paid the total price
II.D12	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.E1	Use of LUNCH MEAT, HOT DOGS during the reference period
II.E2	Use of LUNCH MEAT, HOT DOGS CATEGORY during the reference period

Objective #2 (cont.)

- |       |   |
|-------|---|
| II.E3 | Use of NUMBERED LUNCH MEAT, HOT DOGS ITEM during the reference period   |
| II.E4 | Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED LUNCH MEAT, HOT DOGS ITEM during the reference period   |
| II.E5 | Source of the NUMBERED LUNCH MEAT, HOT DOGS ITEM  |
| II.E6 | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED LUNCH MEAT, HOT DOGS ITEM during the reference period |
| II.E7 | Amount paid for NUMBERED LUNCH MEAT, HOT DOGS ITEM  |
| II.E8 | Is amount paid the total price  |
| II.E9 | What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)  |
| II.F1 | Use of FISH, SEAFOOD during the reference period  |
| II.F2 | Use of FISH, SEAFOOD CATEGORY during the reference period   |
| II.F3 | Use of NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM during the reference period  |
| II.F4 | The form that the NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen                         |
| II.F5 | Was the NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM cooked or uncooked  |
| II.F6 | Was the NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM in shell or had no shell  |
| II.F7 | Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM during the reference period          |
| II.F8 | Source of the NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM   |
| II.F9 | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM during the reference period        |



Objective #2 (cont.)

II.F10	Amount paid for NUMBERED FISH, SEAFOOD ITEM
II.F11	Is amount paid the total price
II.F12	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.G1	Use of EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE during the reference period
II.G2	Use of EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE CATEGORY during the reference period
II.G3	Use of NUMBERED EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE ITEM during the reference period
II.G4	Was the NUMBERED EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE ITEM commercially canned, fresh or, dried or dehydrated
II.G5	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE ITEM during the reference period
II.G6	Source of the NUMBERED EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE ITEM
II.G7	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE ITEM during the reference period
II.G8	Amount paid for NUMBERED EGGS, MILK PRODUCTS, CHEESE ITEM
II.G9	Is amount paid the total price
II.G10	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.H+I1	Use of VEGETABLE during the reference period
II.H+I2	Use of VEGETABLE CATEGORY during the reference period
II.H+I3	Use of NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM during the reference period
II.H+I4	The form that the NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.H+I5	Was the NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM in sauce or not

Objective #2 (cont.)

II.H+I6	Was the NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM labeled low sodium or not
II.H+I7	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM during the reference period
II.H+I8	Source of the NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM
II.H+I9	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM during the reference period
II.H+I10	Amount paid for NUMBERED VEGETABLE ITEM
II.H+I11	Is amount paid the total price
II.H+I12	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.J1	Use of JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS during the reference period
II.J2	Use of JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS CATEGORY during the reference period
II.J3	Use of NUMBERED JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS ITEM during the reference period
II.J4	The form that the NUMBERED JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.J5	Did the NUMBERED JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS ITEM contain sugar or was it artificially sweetened
II.J6	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS ITEM during the reference period
II.J7	Source of the NUMBERED JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS ITEM
II.J8	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS ITEM during the reference period

Objective #2 (cont.)

II.J9	Amount paid for NUMBERED JUICES, DRINKS, ADES, PUNCHES, NECTARS ITEM
II.J10	Is amount paid the total price
II.J11	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.K1	Use of FRUITS during the reference period
II.K2	Use of FRUIT CATEGORY during the reference period
II.K3	Use of NUMBERED FRUIT ITEM during the reference period
II.K4	The form that the NUMBERED FRUIT ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.K5	Was the NUMBERED FRUIT ITEM in syrup or sugar or juice or water or artificial sweetener
II.K6	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED FRUIT ITEM during the reference period
II.K7	Source of the NUMBERED FRUIT ITEM
II.K8	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED FRUIT ITEM during the reference period
II.K9	Amount paid for NUMBERED FRUIT ITEM
II.K10	Is amount paid the total price
II.K11	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.L1	Use of CEREALS, FLOUR, RICE, PASTA, MEAL during the reference period
II.L2	Use of CEREALS, FLOUR, RICE, PASTA, MEAL CATEGORY during the reference period
II.L3	Use of NUMBERED CEREALS, FLOUR, RICE, PASTA, MEAL ITEM during the reference period
II.L4	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED CEREALS, FLOUR, RICE, PASTA, MEAL ITEM during the reference period --

Objective #2 (cont.)

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| II.L5  | Source of the NUMBERED CEREALS, FLOUR, RICE, PASTA, MEAL ITEM  |
| II.L6  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED CEREALS, FLOUR, RICE, PASTA, MEAL ITEM during the reference period |
| II.L7  | Amount paid for NUMBERED CEREALS, FLOUR, RICE, PASTA, MEAL ITEM  |
| II.L8  | Is amount paid the total price   |
| II.L9  | What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)   |
| II.M1  | Use of BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS during the reference period  |
| II.M2  | Use of BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS CATEGORY during the reference period   |
| II.M3  | Use of NUMBERED BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS ITEM during the reference period  |
| II.M4  | The form that the NUMBERED BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen                                 |
| II.M5  | Was the NUMBERED BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS ITEM labeled low-sodium  |
| II.M6  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS ITEM during the reference period                  |
| II.M7  | Source of the NUMBERED BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS ITEM   |
| II.M8  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS ITEM during the reference period                |
| II.M9  | Amount paid for NUMBERED BREAD, ROLLS, BUNS ITEM   |
| II.M10 | Is amount paid the total price   |
| II.M11 | What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)   |
| II.N1  | Use of CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES during the reference period   |

Objective #2 (cont.)

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| II.N2  | Use of CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES CATEGORY during the reference period  |
| II.N3  | Use of NUMBERED CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES ITEM during the reference period   |
| II.N4  | The form that the NUMBERED CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen                  |
| II.N5  | Was the NUMBERED CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES ITEM chocolate iced, iced with another flavor or not iced                         |
| II.N6  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES ITEM during the reference period   |
| II.N7  | Source of the NUMBERED CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES ITEM  |
| II.N8  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES ITEM during the reference period |
| II.N9  | Amount paid for NUMBERED CAKES, CUPCAKES, PIES ITEM  |
| II.N10 | Is amount paid the total price   |
| II.N11 | What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)   |
| II.O1  | Use of COOKIES during the reference period   |
| II.O2  | Use of COOKIES CATEGORY during the reference period  |
| II.O3  | Use of NUMBERED COOKIES ITEM during the reference period   |
| II.O4  | The form that the NUMBERED COOKIES ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen                                |
| II.O5  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED COOKIES ITEM during the reference period                 |
| II.O6  | Source of the NUMBERED COOKIES ITEM  |
| II.O7  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED COOKIES ITEM during the reference period               |

Objective #2 (cont.)

II.08	Amount paid for NUMBERED COOKIES ITEM
II.09	Is amount paid the total price
II.010	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.P1	Use of CRACKERS, SNACK ITEMS during the reference period
II.P2	Use of CRACKERS SNACK ITEM CATEGORY during the reference period
II.P3	Use of NUMBERED CRACKERS, SNACKS ITEM during the reference period
II.P4	Was the NUMBERED CRACKERS, SNACKS ITEM labeled low-sodium or not
II.P5	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED CRACKERS, SNACKS ITEM during the reference period
II.P6	Source of the NUMBERED CRACKERS, SNACKS ITEM
II.P7	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED CRACKERS, SNACKS ITEM during the reference period
II.P8	Amount paid for NUMBERED CRACKERS, SNACKS ITEM
II.P9	Is amount paid the total price
II.P10	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.Q1	Use of SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS during the reference period
II.Q2	Use of SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS CATEGORY during the reference period
II.Q3	Use of NUMBERED SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS ITEM during the reference period
II.Q4	The form that the NUMBERED SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.Q5	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS ITEM during the reference period

Objective #2 (cont.)

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| II.Q6  | Source of the NUMBERED SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS ITEM   |
| II.Q7  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS ITEM during the reference period                                      |
| II.Q8  | Amount paid for NUMBERED SUGAR, SYRUP, SWEETS ITEM   |
| II.Q9  | Is amount paid the total price   |
| II.Q10 | What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)   |
| II.R1  | Use of PUDDINGS, ICE CREAM, BUTTER, MAYONNAISE, FATS, OILS OR SALAD DRESSINGS during the reference period  |
| II.R2  | Use of PUDDINGS, ICE CREAM, BUTTER, MAYONNAISE, FATS, OILS, ETC. CATEGORY during the reference period  |
| II.R3  | Use of NUMBERED PUDDINGS, ICE CREAM, BUTTER, MAYONNAISE, FATS, OILS, ETC. ITEM during the reference period   |
| II.R4  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED PUDDINGS, ICE CREAM, BUTTER, MAYONNAISE, FATS, OILS, ETC. ITEM during the reference period   |
| II.R5  | Source of the NUMBERED PUDDINGS, ICE CREAM, BUTTER, MAYONNAISE, FATS, OILS, ETC. ITEM  |
| II.R6  | Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED PUDDINGS, ICE CREAM, BUTTER, MAYONNAISE, FATS, OILS, ETC. ITEM during the reference period |
| II.R7  | Amount paid for NUMBERED PUDDINGS, ICE CREAM, BUTTER, MAYONNAISE, FATS, OILS, ETC. ITEM  |
| II.R8  | Is amount paid the total price   |
| II.R9  | What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)   |
| II.S1  | Use of SOUPS AND GRAVIES during the reference period   |

Objective #2 (cont.)

II.S2	Use of SOUPS AND GRAVIES CATEGORY during the reference period
II.S3	Use of NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM during the reference period
II.S4	The form that the NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.S5	Was the NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM ready to eat or condensed or semi-condensed
II.S6	Was the NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM labeled low-sodium or not
II.S7	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM during the reference period
II.S8	Source of the NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM
II.S9	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM during the reference period
II.S10	Amount paid for NUMBERED SOUPS AND GRAVIES ITEM
II.S11	Is amount paid the total price
II.S12	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.T+U1	Use of FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS OR MAIN DISHES during the reference period
II.T+U2	Use of FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) CATEGORY during the reference period
II.T+U3	Use of NUMBERED FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) ITEM during the reference period
II.T+U4	The form that the NUMBERED FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen



Objective #2 (cont.)

II.T+U5	Was the NUMBERED FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) ITEM labeled reduced calorie (T) or low-sodium (U)
II.T+U6	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) ITEM during the reference period
II.T+U7	Source of the NUMBERED FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) ITEM
II.T+U8	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) ITEM during the reference period
II.T+U9	Amount paid for NUMBERED FROZEN OR CARRYOUT DINNERS (T) OR MAIN DISHES (U) ITEM
II.T+U10	Is amount paid the total price
II.T+U11	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.V1	Use of NUTS during the reference period
II.V2	Use of NUTS CATEGORY during the reference period
II.V3	Use of NUMBERED NUTS ITEM during the reference period
II.V4	The form that the NUMBERED NUTS ITEM was in when it entered in the household's kitchen
II.V5	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED NUTS ITEM during the reference period
II.V6	Source of the NUMBERED NUTS ITEM
II.V7	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED NUTS ITEM during the reference period
II.V8	Amount paid for NUMBERED NUTS ITEM
II.V9	Is amount paid the total price

Objective #2 (cont.)

II.V10	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.V(cont.)1	Use of BEVERAGES during the reference period
II.V(cont.)2	Use of BEVERAGE CATEGORY during the reference period
II.V(cont.)3	Use of NUMBERED BEVERAGE ITEM during the reference period
II.V(cont.)4	Number of pounds and ounces or other units used of the NUMBERED BEVERAGE ITEM during the reference period
II.V(cont.)5	Source of the NUMBERED BEVERAGE ITEM
II.V(cont.)6	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED BEVERAGE ITEM during the reference period
II.V(cont.)7	Amount paid for NUMBERED BEVERAGE ITEM
II.V(cont.)8	Is amount paid the total price
II.V(cont.)9	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)
II.W1	Were SPICES OR CONDIMENTS bought during the reference period
II.W2	Purchase of SPICES OR CONDIMENTS CATEGORY during the reference period
II.W9	Number of pounds and ounces or other units bought of the NUMBERED SPICES OR CONDIMENTS ITEM during the reference period
II.W10	Amount paid for NUMBERED SPICES OR CONDIMENTS ITEM
II.W11	Is amount paid the total price
II.W12	What price given represents (whether per pound or ounce)

Objective #2 (cont.)

II. Leftovers

The leftover page is used as an accuracy check for all of the food groups. If there indeed are leftovers of certain items originally reported to have been used then interviewers must subtract what is remaining from the amount earlier reported.

---

Objective # 3:                    Assess the Effects of Cash Benefits on Food Shopping  
Patterns and Reliance on Supplementary Sources of Food

Screeners

S. 2A

Number of trips to:

supermarkets  
small neighborhood grocers  
convenience stores  
specialty stores (bakeries, vegetable  
stands, liquor stores, farmer's  
markets, dairy stores, meat markets,  
health food stores)

S. 2B

Amount spent in each store category  
(include food stamps & food checks)

S. 2C

Does amount include \$ value of food  
stamps/checks

S. 2D

Amount spent for non-food items in  
each store category

I. 39A-M

Did you do any of the following  
because there was not enough to eat  
in household (last month):

Borrow food  
Eat at friends/relatives  
use savings  
Borrow money  
Buy food on credit  
Work extra hours/jobs  
Buy/serve less expensive  
meals  
Serve smaller meals  
Eat at church or soup  
kitchen  
Use food bank, food  
pantry or church  
Apply for WIC  
Apply for AFDC/ADC  
Other

I. 40

Receive USDA  
commodities (last month)

Objective #3 (cont.)

I. 41

Grow food or raise  
animals for food

---

Objective # 4:

Assess the effects of cash benefits on recipients'  
attitudes about and experiences with, alternative forms  
of food assistance.

I. 42A

What is good about checks

I. 42B

What is not good about checks

I. 42C

What is good about stamps

I. 42D

What is not good about stamps

I. 42E

More control with stamps over  
food spending

I. 42F

Better budgeting w/food stamps

I. 44

Where most recent check cashed

I. 44A

Purchase required to cash

I. 44B

Fee to cash check

I. 44C

Flat fee or percentage

I. 44D

Amount of fee

I. 44E

Percentage paid

I. 45

Problems cashing check

I. 45A1-6

Problems:

did not have proper ID  
Store did not have enough  
money  
Store refused to cash  
Store limit check amount  
w/o purchase  
After partial spending  
store kept  
remainder as credit

Other

I. 46

Always received checks or  
switched over

I. 47

Aware of checks instead  
of stamps

I. 47A

If checks not available

Objective #4 (cont.)

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
|        | Apply for stamps   |
| I. 47B | If switched to stamps<br>from checks, stay with<br>program |
|        | Since checks:  |
| I. 48  | Amount of food: same,<br>more or less                      |
| I. 48A | Quality of food: same,<br>better or not as good            |
| I. 48B | Change in how long money<br>lasts each month               |

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **STUDY OBJECTIVES AND VARIABLES FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE COST SURVEY**

**ADMINISTRATIVE COST ANALYSIS**  
**DATA DOMAINS, VARIABLES, DATA SOURCES AND METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION**

**OBJECTIVE I: Describe and compare the operation of cash-out in the demonstration site**

---

<b><u>Data Domains and Variables</u></b>	<b><u>Data Sources</u></b>	<b><u>Methods of Data Collection</u></b>	<b><u>Instrument Item #</u></b>
<b>Food benefit issuance activities</b>	- State administrators	- In-person interviews	S.2.A to S.2.J W.2.A to W.2.G
<b>Sequence of Events</b>	- State and local administrators State and local staff	- In-person interviews	S.3.A to S.3.J W.3.A to W.3.G

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE COST ANALYSIS**  
**DATA DOMAINS, VARIABLES, DATA SOURCES AND METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION**

**System Background**

---

<b><u>Data Domains and Variables</u></b>	<b><u>Data Sources</u></b>	<b><u>Methods of Data Collection</u></b>	<b><u>Instrument Item #</u></b>
Institutional structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- State demonstration agreements</li><li>- Organizational Charts</li><li>- Internal Management Reports</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Review of extant materials</li><li>- Review of extant materials</li><li>- Review of extant materials</li></ul>	
Functional responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- State handbooks and regulations</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Review of extant materials</li></ul>	

---



**OBJECTIVE IIA: Assess the effects of cash-out on administrative costs (continued):**

---

<b><u>Data Domains and Variables</u></b>	<b><u>Data Sources</u></b>	<b><u>Methods of Data Collection</u></b>	<b><u>Instrument Item #</u></b>
Benefit loss or diversion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- State Food Stamp Reports SPFS-090,195C,235B,240B,265B</li><li>- FNS Food Stamp Reports FNS 46</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Review of extant materials</li><li>- Review of extant materials</li></ul>	
Overhead Costs: (office space, utilities, telephones, computer equipment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Administrative cost allocation agreements</li><li>- Administrative cost allocation reports</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Review of extant materials</li><li>- Review of extant materials</li></ul>	

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE COST ANALYSIS**  
**DATA DOMAINS, VARIABLES, DATA SOURCES AND METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION**

**OBJECTIVE IIB: Assess the effects of cash-out on the time and costs of specific activities**

---

<b><u>Data Domains and Variables</u></b>	<b><u>Data Sources</u></b>	<b><u>Methods of Data Collection</u></b>	<b><u>Instrument Item #</u></b>
Labor time per activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- State and local staff</li><li>- State Time and Production Reports (SAPFG7)</li><li>- CSIS Morning Reports</li><li>- Office of Workload Analysis Standard summaries</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In-person interviews</li><li>- Review of extant materials</li><li>- Review of extant materials</li><li>- Review of extant materials</li></ul>	S.3.A to S.3.J W.3.A to W.3.G
Wages and Fringe Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- State wage schedules</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Review of extant materials</li></ul>	

---